

*Laciniaria scariosa* var. *trilisioides* Farwell, Rep. Mich. Acad. Sci. xvii. 170–171 (1916)—*Liatris novae-angliae* var. *Nieuwlandii* f. *trilisioides* (Farwell) Shinnars, Amer. Mid. Nat. xxix. 31 (1943)—was reported as a sweet-scented form, but the type has not been available.

*Laciniaria serotina* Greene, Pitt. iv. 315 (1901)—probably an intermediate between *Liatris spicata* (L.) Willd. and *L. pycnostachya* Michx. (See discussion no. 1).

*Liatris turbinata* Sweet, Hort. Brit. ed. i. 220 (1836) = nomen.

*Liatris uniflora* Raf. New Fl. Amer. iv. 76 (1836)—by description and region of collection may very well apply to specimens of *L. squarrosa* (L.) Willd. var. *gracilentata*, bearing one head only.

*Liatris varia* Herb. Banks, Pursh, Fl. ii. 508 (1814)—published in synonymy of *L. heterophylla* R. Br.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,  
Hamilton, Ontario.

---

## IMPATIENS ROYLEI VERSUS I. GLANDULIFERA

C. A. WEATHERBY

The handsome Himalayan species of *Impatiens* commonly known as *I. Roylei* has now escaped from cultivation and established itself so successfully at so many localities, from Nova Scotia to Washington and British Columbia, that it has earned a place in our manuals. Its correct name therefore becomes a matter of some importance.

*I. Roylei* is a substitute name given by Walpers, Repert. i. 475 (1842), to *I. glandulifera* Royle because of *I. glandulifera* Arnott, which Walpers either supposed to be earlier or, at a time when priority was more lightly regarded than at present, thought preferable. Since the title-page of Royle's Illustrations bears the date 1839 and that of the first volume of the Companion to the Botanical Magazine, in which Arnott's species was published, 1835, Walpers may well have thought he was observing strict priority. In any case, his name was adopted by Sir Joseph Hooker in the Flora of British India and the Epitome of the British Indian Species of Impatiens, and by nearly everyone else who has had occasion to refer to the species, though *I. glandulifera* has persisted to some extent in horticultural literature and has been regularly cited as a synonym by L. H. Bailey (e. g. in Hortus Second).

In 1900, however, in a note which seems to have been generally overlooked (Journ. Bot. xxxviii. 87–88), Hiern pointed out that both Royle's work and the Companion were published in parts and that the part of the former which contains *I. glandulifera* was issued more than a year before the part of the Companion in which Arnott's homonym appeared. Sprague in 1933 (Kew Bull. 362–364; 378–390) went into the matter in detail, establishing dates of issue for all parts of both works and confirming Hiern's conclusions. They were further confirmed by Stearn in 1943 (Journ. Arnold Arb. xxiv. 484–487) from a copy of Royle's Illustrations still in the original fascicles which he discovered.

The correct name for the species is, then, *I. glandulifera* Royle. Bibliography (the dates for Royle and Arnott taken from Sprague) is as follows.

IMPATIENS GLANDULIFERA Royle, Ill. Bot. Himalaya Mts. t. 28, fig. 2, plate without analyses of flower, (March, 1834) and p. 151 (Jan., 1835); Lindl. in Bot. Reg. xxvi. t. 22 (1840), as *glanduligera*; Hook. in Bot. Mag. t. 4020 (1843), as *glanduligera*; Sprague in Kew Bull. 1933: 386. Not *I. glandulifera* Arn. in Comp. Bot. Mag. i. 322 (June, 1836).—*I. Roylei* Walp. Repert. i. 475 (1842); Hook. f. & Thomps. in Journ. Linn. Soc. iv. 127 (1860); Hook. f. Fl. Brit. India, i. 468 (1872) and in Rec. Bot. Survey India, iv. 7 (1904); E. Loew in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. xiv. 167, t. 1, 2 (1892); Bailey, Standard Cycl. Hort. 1644, fig. 1954 (1915); Toppin in Kew Bull. 1920: 347.

The flowers of *I. glandulifera* are typically, except for the short green spur, of a uniform dark magenta-red without spots, and, with a single exception, all the American material I have seen is of this typical form, or at least indistinguishable in the dried state. At St. John, New Brunswick, however, where the species crowds several small areas of moist waste ground, many individuals have pale pink corollas with brownish or reddish spots on the sac, yellowish spur and a narrow green band running along the upper side of the sac to the spur. This is apparently *I. Roylei* var. *pallidiflora* Hook. f. in Bot. Mag. t. 7647 (1899). Since Hooker gives no differential characters except color of flower and size of plant for his variety and since the St. John material seems to show no others, this may appropriately be treated as a color-form and, at some risk of repeating a combination already made in recent European literature, be called

I. GLANDULIFERA Royle, forma **pallidiflora** (Hook. f.) n. comb.  
*I. Roylei* var. *pallidiflora* Hook. f. in Bot. Mag. t. 7647 (1899).

Hegi, Ill. Fl. Mittel-Eur. v. 314 (1924), describes a pure albino as *I. Roylei* forma *albida* Hort. This is very likely the same as *I. Roylei* var. *candida* (Lindl.) Hook. f. Fl. Brit. India, i. 469 (1872); *I. candida* Lindl. in Bot. Reg. xxvi. Misc. Not. 85 (1840) and xxvii. t. 20 (1841). I saw no pure white flowers at St. John.<sup>1</sup>

#### GRAY HERBARIUM.

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was in type I have, through the kindness of Prof. G. N. Jones, seen further specimens of two collections by him—Mukilteo, Snohomish Co., Washington, Aug. 4, 1937, no. 10545 and Port Moody, British Columbia, Aug. 14, 1935, s. n. These show that the plants at both the above stations were of forma *pallidiflora*. I have seen no other western material.

*Volume 48, no. 575, containing pages 329–392, was issued 7 November, 1946.*

#### ERRATA

Page 14, line 28; *for 1006 read 1000.*

Page 38, line 5; *for transfer read transfers.*

Page 44, line 23; *for aments, with read aments with.*

Page 142, line 1; *for S. U. Se. read Se. U. S.*

Page 173, line 23; *for Willd. read Michx.*

Page 254, line 4; *for 16028 read 10028.*

Page 262, line 31; *for Jones read Jonas.*